UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,525	10/23/2003	Masahiro Kamiya	117605	6376

25944 7590 02/04/2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER	
EKPO, NNENNA NGOZI	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2425	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/690,525	KAMIYA, MASAHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NNENNA N. EKPO	2425	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 November 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *11* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10, 12-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 12-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Billmaier (U.S. Patent No. 7,076,202) in view of Zadesky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,333,092).

Regarding **claims 1 and 9**, Billmaier discloses an electronic program guide display control apparatus for displaying a part of an electronic program guide on a display screen and scrolling the display of a display area in response to specification operation on the display screen, the electronic program guide display control apparatus comprising (see col. 6, lines 18-54, fig. 2):

a specification point detection unit for detecting a specification point on the display screen (see col. 7, lines 57-col. 8, line 5, col. 11, lines 1-11).

a scroll control unit for scrolling the display of the display area based on a positional relation between the specification point detected by the specification point detection unit and a predetermined point on the display screen (see col. 13, lines 9-15),

In an analogous art, Zadesky et al. discloses the scroll control unit changes a scroll amount based on a distance from the predetermined point to the specification point, and changes a scroll direction based on a direction of the specification point with respect to the predetermined point when the display is scrolled from a first portion of the data to a second portion of the data, the second portion being different from the first portion (see col. 7, lines 22-61, col. 12, lines 21-38, col. 14, lines 11-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electronic program guide system of Billmaier to include touch screen for scrolling from a first portion of the data to a second portion of the data, the second portion being different than the first portion as taught by Zadesky et al. for the advantage of providing an intuitive way to scroll on a display screen.

Regarding **claim 2**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Zadesky et al. discloses wherein the specification point detection unit detects a point on the display screen pressed by a user with the user's finger as the specification point (see col. 7, lines 3-17, col. 11, lines 65-67, col. 12, lines 21-24 and fig. 1).

Regarding **claim 3**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 2*). Zadesky et al. discloses wherein the scroll control unit scrolls the display of the display area based on the specification point detected by the

specification point detection unit and a center point of the display screen as the predetermined point (see col. 7, lines 22-61, col. 12, lines 21-38, col. 14, lines 11-14).

Regarding **claim 4**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 3*). Zadesky et al. discloses wherein the scroll control unit scrolls the display of the display area based on a direction from the center point to the specification point and at least one of a distance from the center point to the specification point and specification pressure at the specification point (see col. 2, lines 4-20, col. 3, lines 11-27).

Regarding **claim 6**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Billmaier discloses a program-unit regulation unit for regulating a move distance of the scrolling by the scroll control unit in program units (see col. 13, lines 9-15).

Regarding **claim 7**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Billmaier discloses a time-unit regulation unit for regulating a move distance of the scrolling by the scroll control unit in predetermined time units (see col. 13, lines 9-15).

Regarding **claim 8**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Billmaier discloses a broadcast-service-unit regulation unit

for regulating a move distance of the scrolling by the scroll control unit in broadcast service units (see col. 13, lines 9-15).

Claim 10 is directed toward embody the method of claim 9 in "computer readable medium". It would have been obvious to embody the procedures of Billmaier and Zadesky et al. as discussed with respect to claim 9 in a "computer readable medium" in order that the instructions could be automatically performed by a processor.

Regarding **claim 12**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Zadesky et al. discloses wherein the scroll control unit changes the scroll amount based on the distance from the predetermined point to the specification point such that the scroll amount increases based on increasing distance from the predetermined point to the specification point (see col. 2, lines 4-20, col. 3, lines 11-27).

Regarding **claim 13**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 9*). Zadesky et al. discloses wherein the scroll amount is changed based on the distance from the predetermined point to the specification point such that the scroll amount increases based on increasing distance from the predetermined point to the specification point (see col. 2, lines 4-20, col. 3, lines 11-27).

3. **Claims 5 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Billmaier (U.S. Patent No. 7,076,202) and Zadesky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,333,092) as applied to *claim 1* above, and further in view of Amro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,443).

Regarding **claim 5**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*).

In an analogous art, Amro et al. discloses wherein if the specification point detected by the specification point detection unit is an end portion of the display screen, the scroll control unit displays content of an end portion of the screen positioned in a direction from the center point to the specification point on the display screen (see col. 5, lines 52-col. 6, lines 10, lines 40-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the systems and methods of Billmaier and Zadesky et al. to include wherein if the specification point detected by the specification point detection unit is an end portion of the display screen, the scroll control unit displays content of an end portion of the screen positioned in a direction from the center point to the specification point on the display screen as taught by Amro et al. for the advantage of determining the location of the finger.

Regarding **claim 14**, Billmaier and Zadesky et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*).

In an analogous art, Amro et al. discloses wherein the specification point detection unit determines whether a user's finger is moved off of the display screen, and if the user's finger is moved off the display screen, the specification point detection unit determines an image area to which a move is to be made based on the specification point last detected by the specification point detection unit (see col. 5, lines 52-col. 6, lines 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the systems and methods of Billmaier and Zadesky et al. to include wherein the specification point detection unit determines whether a user's finger is moved off of the display screen, and if the user's finger is moved off the display screen, the specification point detection unit determines an image area to which a move is to be made based on the specification point last detected by the specification point detection unit as taught by Amro et al. for the advantage of being cost efficient.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NNENNA N. EKPO whose telephone number is (571)270-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian T. Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nnenna Ekpo/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425
January 29, 2010.

/Brian T. Pendleton/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425